

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 12, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 1-20 were pending, and rejected claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 have been amended, new claims 21 and 22 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-22 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as non-statutory. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Page 6 of the Office Action rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Aho and Gerace.

Aho discusses a system that presents a video of a scene, such as motion down streets of a city. Different objects in the scene, such as a bus, can be presented to the user via a virtual reality system that presents the user with a virtual reality image of a part ("popped out" part) of the real scene. As the user travels the route a communication channel can be set up between the user and the virtual reality objects in the scene. For example if a restaurant appears in the video scene and is made present ("pop-ups) in the virtual reality scene, a communication channel between the user and the restaurant can be set up.

Gerace discusses a system for generating a profile of users based on the computer activity and advertisement viewing habits of the users. That is, as the users view advertisements histories are created. These histories are analyzed to allow the system to customize advertisements future advertisements.

In contrast, the present invention (see claims 1, 11 and 18) allows a user to set up a chat with an imaginary store sales person associated with an object, such as a dress, being displayed to the user at the users request. During the chat, in "real time" the chat text (or "character information") is analyzed looking for product related key words. When a "key word" of the product is encountered the "attribute" of the product associated with the key word is reflected ("reflecting") in the image of the product. For example, when the word "color" appears in a chat about a product, say the dress, and the word "color" is a key word of the product, that key word

in the chat is highlighted indicating to the user that the key word can be selected ("clicked-on"). When the highlighted key word is selected, an attribute of the object associated with the key word is displayed, such as displaying the colors of the dress that can be purchased. That is, the chat is analyzed to emphasize to the user what attributes of displayed products can be further explored.

Aho and Gerace, together or alone, do not teach or suggest such a system.

It is submitted that the invention of the independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 6 emphasizes analyzing the chat for the key word and then sending the user an advertisement corresponding to the key word. The prior art of Aho and/or Gerace does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claims 21 and 22 emphasize analyzing the chat about a product for key words and then displaying product attributes corresponding to the key words. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that these new claims, which are different and not narrower than prior filed claims distinguishes over the prior art.


It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. section 101 and 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/14/15

By:   
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501